UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/692,023	10/22/2003	Arno Blau	SCHWP0183USA	8542
RENNER, OTTO, BOISSELLE & SKLAR, LLP			EXAMINER	
Nineteenth Floor			COMSTOCK, DAVID C	
1621 Euclid Avenue Cleveland, OH 44115-2191			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3733	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/20/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/692,023	BLAU ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	DAVID COMSTOCK	3733				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 16(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	Lely filed the mailing date of this communication. (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 De	ecember 2008					
	action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar		secution as to the merits is				
•	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-14</u> is/are pending in the application.	4) Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.					
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-9 and 11-14</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) <u>10</u> is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>25 July 2007</u> is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:						
, ,	 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 					
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
200 the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
Attachment(s)	4) 🗖 Indon de 0	(DTO 412)				
1)						
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application						
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6) U Other:						

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's Request for Continued Examination filed 24 December 2008 and the submission filed 29 September 2008 have been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-3, 6-9 and 11-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bertuch, Jr. (4,305,394).

Bertuch, Jr. disclose a system for positioning an implant 109 comprising a holding element, e.g., 23, 31, 55 and a guiding sleeve 13 (see, e.g., Figs. 1-7). The holding element and implant connect at a theaded interface and both comprise a conically tapered section (i.e. the bottom of the threaded hole in the implant and the end of the threaded connection element of the holding element). The guiding sleeve

includes entry and exit openings having rims. The holding element is configured to rotate and translate within the sleeve (as by rotation within the threads 37, cf. Figs. 4 and 5). The holding element has clearly been introduced into the sleeve, but is also removable therefrom by unthreading the threads 25 from the end sleeve 21 and by unthreading the holding element from portion 39.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 4 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bertuch, Jr. (4,305,394) in view of Bertin (5,320,625).

Bertuch, Jr. discloses the claimed invention except for the navigational element. Bertin also discloses a system for positioning an implant 52 comprising a holding element 82, a guiding sleeve 96 and a navigational element 102, 104 on the sleeve (see Figs. 4 and 5). The navigational element allows the device to be positioned accurately to ensure an accurate and effective surgical procedure (see, e.g., col. 11, lines 25-48). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the implant positioning system of Bertuch, Jr. with a navigational element, in view of Bertin, in order to allow the device to be positioned accurately to ensure an accurate and effective surgical procedure. A sliding element,

Art Unit: 3733

e.g. 65 (which slides within hole 67), is connected to the guiding sleeve via flange 41 and flange support 39. It is noted that the navigational element as taught by Bertin would be connected to the outer structure, i.e., the guiding sleeve. Even if the device did not set foth sliding elements such as element 65, it would have been further obvious to provide the navigational element on a sliding portion or on any of numerous other known adjustment mechanisms, since it has been held that the provision of adjustability, where needed, involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Stevens*, 101 USPQ 284 (CCPA 1954).

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 10 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 29 September 2008 have been reconsidered but they are not persuasive.

It is noted that the handle 7 in Bertuch can be considered a "tensioning device" as set forth in claim 1. In addition, the element in Bertin is at least capable of being detected or tracked by various known navigation systems including, for example, direct visualization systems, 3D optical scanners, coordinate measuring machines and imaging systems such as "x-ray". As such, it can fairly be considered to be a navigation element.

Application/Control Number: 10/692,023 Page 5

Art Unit: 3733

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to David Comstock whose telephone number is (571) 272-

4710. Please leave a detailed voice message if examiner is unavailable. If attempts to

reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eduardo

Robert can be reached at (571) 272-4719. The fax phone number for the organization

where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/David Comstock/

Examiner, Art Unit 3733

/Eduardo C. Robert/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3733